

more effectively than the stem cell research from embryos that some of my colleagues favor. We would think that this would be enough to convince folks where they should be on this important issue.

In case it is not, the fact that living human embryos would be deliberately destroyed in order to obtain their stem cells to me is absolutely appalling. Once we begin justifying the killing of human beings at one stage of development, we invite other troubling applications.

Stem cell research from human embryos establishes a bad precedent and is ethically wrong. Human life is too valuable. Let us condemn the logic of faulty research that extinguishes one life on the pretext of extending others. Instead, we should support the promising research methods that will save lives without ending others.

THE SUGAR PROGRAM

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues defend the sugar subsidy as a no-net-cost program. If that was ever true, it is not true today. The sugar program costs plenty.

It costs tax dollars. Last year the Department of Agriculture spent \$465 million on sugar subsidies.

It costs consumers. The General Accounting Office, a congressional agency, estimates that the people who consume and use sugar, which is all of us, pay an additional \$1.9 billion a year because the Federal sugar subsidy keeps prices higher than they would be in a free market.

And the sugar program costs industry. Companies in my community, in my neighborhood, and other places throughout the country are moving away because the price is too high. That is unfair. It is unfair to consumers, it is unfair to workers, and it is unfair to America.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE IS CRAFTING BALANCED, LONG-TERM ENERGY POLICY

(Mrs. WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House today starts working on a comprehensive energy bill. It is going to be a balanced, long-term approach on energy policy for the Nation.

We have made wonderful strides in the last 20 years in conserving energy in this country. The refrigerator that we can buy today down at our local appliance store is one-third more efficient than it was in 1972.

We also have to increase supplies of energy and reduce our reliance on foreign oil. We have to improve our energy infrastructure, strengthen it, and give ourselves safe pipelines and modern transmission grids and refineries to get the energy where it needs to be.

We have a wonderful opportunity this summer to craft a policy important to the future of this country and to every citizen who pumps gas into their car or pays the family electric bill. We should seize that opportunity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Although some minutes have passed since the remarks that prompt the Chair to mention it, the Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate in the House may not include quotations of Senators, except in making legislative history on a pending measure.

FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution No. 36, the flag protection constitutional amendment.

The flag stands for all of us in this wonderful country, and the honor we bestow upon it as our symbol is as great as the contributions each of us should hope to make for our Nation.

If the Stars and Stripes could talk, I am sure that they would say, "I am what you make of me. It is up to you to keep me raised high and flying. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I am all that you hope to be and have the courage to try for."

"I am song and fear, struggle and panic, and ennobling hope. I am the day's work of the weakest man, and the largest dream of the most daring. I am the battle of yesterday and the mistake of tomorrow. I am the clutch of an idea and the reasoned purpose of resolution."

"I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all that you believe I can be. I am what you make of me, nothing more."

Mr. Speaker, I consistently vote for this amendment because I believe that all Americans should be allowed to vote on whether to protect our flag.

THE LAW AND ETHICAL STANDARDS DEMAND DISCONTINUATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING OF DESTRUCTIVE HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, adult stem cell research is pro-life, but destroying nascent human beings for research is not pro-life.

It is said that facts are stubborn things. Fact No. 1 in this debate, Mr. Speaker, is that Congress outlawed Federal funding of destructive human embryo research in 1996. When the Clinton administration authorized the use of Federal funding for embryo stem cell research, that law became yet another law trampled by the Clinton administration. I pray that President Bush and his administration will not follow suit.

Fact No. 2, Mr. Speaker: As Dr. Weldon said, not one medical treatment has been developed from research done on stem cells from human embryos. Virtually every advancement cited today on this floor was accomplished with adult stem cell research. Researchers describe the usefulness of embryonic stem cells as conjecture.

The Washington Post today alarmingly reports of the creation of human embryos for the express purpose of their destruction. I implore the President to make the morally right decision regarding embryo stem cell research. The ethics and the law demand that we discontinue Federal funding.

The President should do justice, enforce the law, and choose life so that we and our children may live.

□ 1045

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is time to pass meaningful campaign finance reform legislation. Let us take soft money out of politics, let us restore integrity to our political system.

The bipartisan Shays-Meehan Campaign Reform Act has passed in this body twice before. We should finally move to make it law. Shays-Meehan bans soft money for national parties, it reins in campaign advertisements masquerading as issue advocacy, enhances disclosure of political expenditures, and provides the Federal Election Commission with the teeth it needs to enforce the law.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership is determined to drive a stake through the heart of all campaign finance reform. They have introduced a sham alternative that is intended to delay, distract, and to ultimately kill real reform. The bill will not clean up our campaign finance system but rather allow even more money to flow through it.

Their bill would allow a wealthy couple to give \$1.26 million in hard and

soft money to a national party in an election campaign, and it allows Federal candidates to raise unlimited amounts of soft money for State parties to spend on TV attack ads.

Let us stand up for clean elections, let us stand up for good political discourse in this country, let us stand up for real campaign finance reform.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for stem cell research under the strict NIH guidelines. I want to thank the Members on both sides of the aisle who have joined with me, both pro choice and pro life, in support of this important research.

This is not a political issue, it is not a partisan issue, it is a medical issue and it is a human issue. It is, for some, a life and death issue. It affects our seniors, women and men; and it affects our children. It goes without saying that the children of this country deserve the best medical research that one can find.

I speak of the children with juvenile diabetes, known as the silent killer. More than 1 million Americans have Type 1, which is the juvenile diabetes, a disease that strikes children suddenly, makes them insulin dependent for life, and carries the constant threat of devastating complications. Someone is diagnosed with Type 1 diabetes every hour. It can and does strike adults as well.

In diabetes research, it is hoped that stem cells can be differentiated into insulin-producing islet cells. In essence, this would be a cure. There are children fighting cancer, and stem cell research offers them hope. Stem cell research will no doubt, in one way or another, touch all Americans. We cannot, we must not shut that door.

Mr. Speaker, I urge President Bush to keep the NIH guidelines in place.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, many of us just came out of a meeting with the President, and after the meeting he was asked about this issue. He is conflicted. It is a difficult decision on stem cell research. He is not polling. I reject any argument that that has been done, and I am really disappointed in my colleagues for mentioning this. This has long-term implications.

One of my colleagues talked about Galileo and that the planets move and science. Science indicates that individual distinct life begins at concep-

tion and a distinct DNA, a distinct life entity is there. That is why to pro-life supporters, this is an abortion debate.

We should use adult stem cell research to cure these diseases. We should protect the most vulnerable. We should support life from conception to natural death.

FEDERAL FARM POLICY

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today, in a few minutes, we will take up the agricultural bill. In agricultural appropriations we do several things: we have a program in this country with our Federal agricultural policy that guarantees a farmer a minimum price that they can receive from the program commodity crops that they grow.

The problem we are dealing with in an amendment I will offer today says there should be a limitation on how much money goes to any particular producer. The limitation under current law is \$75,000. In the bill that was debated under suspension, unavailable for any amendments 2 weeks ago, we increased that to \$150,000.

I think when we consider that the giant farm operations are taking a lot of that price support money and realistically taking away from the small family farmer, we need to decide what Federal farm policy should be. I would ask my colleagues to consider an amendment of \$75,000 per producer.

We have producers in this country that are now getting \$1.2 million. The average size of farm in this country is 420 acres. We have farms up to 80,000 acres. We should be looking at helping family farmers with Federal farm policy.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 42, answered “present” 2, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

YEAS—366

Abercrombie	Ehlers	LaHood
Ackerman	Ehrlich	Lampson
Akin	Emerson	Langevin
Allen	Eshoo	Lantos
Andrews	Etheridge	Large
Armey	Evans	Larson (CT)
Baca	Everett	LaTourette
Bachus	Farr	Leach
Baker	Fattah	Lee
Baldacci	Ferguson	Levin
Baldwin	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Barcia	Fletcher	Lewis (KY)
Barr	Foley	Linder
Barrett	Forbes	Lipinski
Bartlett	Ford	Lofgren
Barton	Fossella	Lowe
Bass	Frank	Lucas (KY)
Becerra	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Bentsen	Frost	Luther
Bereuter	Gallely	Maloney (CT)
Berkley	Ganske	Maloney (NY)
Berman	Gekas	Manzullo
Berry	Gephardt	Markey
Biggert	Gibbons	Mascara
Billirakis	Gilchrest	Matheson
Bishop	Gillmor	Matsui
Blagojevich	Gilman	McCarthy (MO)
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Blunt	Goode	McCollum
Boehler	Goodlatte	McCrery
Boehner	Gordon	McGovern
Bonilla	Goss	McHugh
Bonior	Graham	McInnis
Bono	Granger	McIntyre
Boswell	Graves	McKeon
Boyd	Green (WI)	McKinney
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Grucci	Meek (FL)
Brown (OH)	Hall (OH)	Meeks (NY)
Brown (SC)	Hall (TX)	Mica
Bryant	Hansen	Millender-
Burr	Harman	McDonald
Burton	Hart	Miller (FL)
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Callahan	Hayes	Miller, George
Calvert	Hayworth	Mink
Camp	Herger	Mollohan
Cannon	Hill	Moore
Capito	Hilleary	Moran (VA)
Capps	Hinchey	Morella
Cardin	Hinojosa	Murtha
Carson (OK)	Hobson	Myrick
Castle	Hoeffel	Nadler
Chabot	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Chambliss	Holden	Neal
Clay	Holt	Nethercutt
Clement	Honda	Ney
Clyburn	Hooley	Northup
Coble	Horn	Nussle
Collins	Hostettler	Obey
Combest	Houghton	Oliver
Condit	Hulshof	Ortiz
Conyers	Hyde	Osborne
Cooksey	Inslee	Ose
Cox	Isakson	Otter
Cramer	Israel	Owens
Crenshaw	Issa	Oxley
Cubin	Istook	Pascarell
Culberson	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Cunningham	(TX)	Pelosi
Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Pence
Davis (FL)	Jenkins	Peterson (PA)
Davis (IL)	John	Petri
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Phelps
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Pickering
Deal	Johnson, E. B.	Pitts
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Pombo
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pomeroy
DeLay	Keller	Portman
DeMint	Kelly	Price (NC)
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Pryce (OH)
Diaz-Balart	Kerns	Putnam
Dicks	Kildee	Quinn
Doggett	Kilpatrick	Radanovich
Dooley	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Doolittle	King (NY)	Rangel
Doyle	Kingston	Regula
Dreier	Kirk	Rehberg
Duncan	Kleczka	Reyes
Dunn	Kolbe	Rivers
Edwards	LaFalce	Rodriguez